

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 17, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1 – 15 were pending in this application. Claims 1 – 15 were rejected.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11 – 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, specifically because of the limitation “the determining” in line 3.

In response, claim 11 has been amended to remove the offending language, and to insert language that particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention. This amendment

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 - 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasuda, U.S. Pat. No. 5,611,061.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda does not contain or describe each of the limitations of independent claim 1. For example, in decoding an instruction, Yasuda does not determine whether the interrupt condition corresponds to a fast interrupt. Merely describing the decoding of an instruction, as done in Yasuda in col. 6, lines 50-54, does not teach or describe the step of determining whether the instruction (decoded or not) corresponds to a particular interrupt condition, led alone a fast interrupt. In another example, Yasuda (specifically in Figures 6A and 6B) does not show the loading of a *second instruction within the interrupt service routine* into the *program counter*. Yasuda does not teach, describe, or even mention the particular loading of the second instruction of the ISR into any register, led along the program counter. Similarly, claim 2 is believed

allowable because Yasuda does not show the step of determining as described in independent claim 1. Yasuda, therefor, does not teach or describe each of the limitations of independent claim 1 and thus does not describe the limitations of dependent claims 2 - 8. Consequently, it is believed that claims 1 – 8 are allowable over Yasuda. For the reasons stated above, consideration and withdrawal of the rejection from claim 1 and its respective dependent claims, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Laurenti, U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,578.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that Laurenti does not teach or describe each of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9. For example, Laurenti does not teach or describe, in columns 123 – 124 and 152, whether the interrupt is designated as a fast interrupt. While Laurenti may describe the use of fast and slow devices, Laurenti does not make a distinction of handling interrupts depending on whether the *interrupt* itself is designated as fast or slow as required by the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9. Laurenti, therefor, does not teach or describe each of the limitations of independent claims 1 and/or 9. It is thus respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 9, and by extension their respective dependent claims 2-8 and 10-15, are allowable over the prior art of record. For the reasons stated above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection from the independent claims and their respective dependent claims, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zaiki, U.S. Pat. No. 6,292,866.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that Zaiki does not contain or describe each of the limitations of independent claim 1. For example, Zaiki does not teach or describe, in the Abstract or col. 6, lines 40-45 whether the interrupt is designated as a fast interrupt. While Zaiki may describe the analysis of the interrupt to determine the cause of the interrupt, Zaiki does not make a distinction of handling interrupts depending on whether the *interrupt* itself is designated as fast or slow as required by the limitations of independent claim 1. Zaiki therefor, does not describe each of the limitations of independent claim 1, led alone the additional limitations of claim 2. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 2 are allowable over the prior art of record. For the reasons stated above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection from claims 1 and 2, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Zaiki in view of Yasuda.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. As indicated before, Yasuda does not determine whether the interrupt condition corresponds to a fast interrupt, as required in the limitations of independent claim 1, and thus dependent claims 3 and 4. Merely describing the decoding of an instruction, as done in Yasuda in col. 6, lines 50-54, does not teach or describe the step of determining whether the instruction (decoded or not) corresponds to a particular interrupt condition, led alone a fast interrupt. Zaiki similarly fails to teach or describe the step of determining whether the instruction corresponds to a *fast interrupt*, a limitation required by claim 1 upon which claims 3 and 4 are dependent and thus both incorporate. Consequently, Yasuda and Zaiki, either alone or in combination, do not teach, describe, or even mention the

determination of the interrupt as a fast interrupt and/or of handling one interrupt differently from other interrupts. Because Yasuda and Zaiki fail to teach the limitations of the independent claim upon which claims 3 and 4 depend, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 4 are allowable over the prior art of record. For the reasons stated above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection from claims 3 and 4, are respectfully requested.

All amendments are made in a good faith effort to advance the prosecution on the merits. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution on the claims as originally filed in this or appropriate continuation, continuation-in-part and/or divisional applications.

Applicants respectfully request that the amendments submitted herein be entered, and further request reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants respectfully submit that no amendments have been made to the pending claims for the purpose of overcoming any prior art rejections that would restrict the literal scope of the claims or equivalents thereof.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections, and that there be an early notice of allowance.


SUMMARY

In light of the above amendments and remarks Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of the same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney of record by telephone or facsimile.

Applicants believe that there are no fees due in association with the filing of this Response. However, should the Commissioner deem that any fees are due, including any fees for extensions of time, Applicants respectfully request that the Commissioner accept this as a Petition Therefor, and direct that any and all fees due are charged to Baker Botts L.L.P. **Deposit Account No. 02-0383, (formerly Baker & Botts, L.L.P.) Order Number 068354.1438.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. (023640)

By: 

Ronald L. Chichester

Registration No. 36,765

One Shell Plaza

910 Louisiana Street

Houston, Texas 77002-4995

Telephone: 713.229.1341

Facsimile: 713.229.7741

EMail: Ronald.Chichester@bakerbotts.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Date: June 16, 2004